DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 117 319 CE 005 673

AUTHOR Christoffel, Pamela H.
TITLE Vocational Education: Alternatives for New Federal Legislation.
INSTITUTION College Entrance Examination Board, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Sep 75
NOTE 63p.
AVAILABLE FROM College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, New Jersey 08540 ($1.75)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$3.50 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Career Education; Educational Administration; *Educational Legislation; *Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Government Role; Program Evaluation; Relevance (Education); State Programs; Tables (Data); *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Vocational Education Act 1963

ABSTRACT

An analysis of vocational education legislation and major issues is presented in the document, which opens with a survey of recent trends and an explanation of the 10 parts of the existing Vocational Education Act. A brief review of evaluations of Office of Education (OE) program administration points out controversial findings. Current issues include the percentage allotment of funds, program consolidation, OE program administration, career education, the role of guidance and counseling, the composition of State boards, funding authorization level, and facility construction. Congressional hearings are examined in terms of: organization; interested parties, including those sponsoring or testifying about legislation; various bills, with detailed descriptions and comments on six bills; and recommendations, with brief descriptions of the public position taken by six groups who have made recommendations for legislation. Next steps for legislation are outlined. Discussion of the Vocational Education Act as amended through 1974 and its program statistics, involving authorization and appropriations, expenditures, enrollment, and proposals are appended. (LH)

**********
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
**********

DEC 1 1975

ED117319

# Vocational Education: Alternatives for New Federal Legislation

Pamela H. Christoffel

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

College Entrance Examination Board

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

September
1975

A Policy Study
from the Washington Office
of the
College Entrance Examination Board

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

The College Entrance Examination Board is a nonprofit membership organization that provides tests and other educational services for students, schools, and colleges. The membership is composed of more than 2,000 colleges, schools, school systems, and education associations. Representatives of the members serve on the Board of Trustees and advisory councils and committees that consider the Board's programs and participate in the determination of its policies and activities.

The Washington Office of the College Board conducts research relevant to public issues in education, with emphasis on the financing of postsecondary education. The office is located at 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Copies of this report may be ordered from College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, New Jersey 08540. The price is $1.75.

Copyright © 1975 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved.

Staff of the Washington Office

Lois D. Rice, Vice President, College Entrance Examination Board

Lawrence E. Gladieux, Director

Alan P. Wagner, Policy Research Associate

Pamela H. Christoffel, Research and Development Associate

Laurence J. Tenison, Policy Research Assistant

Washington Office Advisory Panel

Norman E. Beck, Director of Student Financial Aids
Ball State University

Ernest L. Boyer, Chancellor
State University of New York

Norman C. Francis, President
Xavier University of Louisiana

Fred A. Hargadon, Dean of Admissions
Stanford University

Floretta D. McKenzie, Area 11 Assistant Superintendent
Montgomery County Public Schools, Maryland

Arthur S. Marmaduke, Director
California State Scholarship and Loan Commission

Kenneth L. Wooten, Director of Admissions and Records
University of Mississippi

Contents


Introduction. . . . . 1

Background. . . . . 3

Current legislation. . . . . 3

Office of Education administration of the programs . . . . . 4

Current issues. . . . . 9

Percentage allotment of funds. . . . . 9

Program consolidation. . . . . 11

Office of Education program administration . . . . . 12

Career education . . . . . 12

What should be the role of guidance and counseling? . . . . 13

Other current issues . . . . . 14

Congressional hearings. . . . . 15

Organization . . . . . 15

The interested parties . . . . . 17

The various bills and some reactions to them . . . . . 18

Other recommendations. . . . . 33

Where do we go from here? . . . . . 42

Next steps . . . . . 42

Content. . . . . 42

Appendix A. Vocational Education Act as amended through 1974 . . 44

Appendix B. Vocational Education Act program statistics. . . . . 50

**Acknowledgments**

The staff work for this study was carried out by Pamela H. Christoffel, with assistance from Lawrence E. Gladieux, Director of the Washington office. Lowell Burkett, Newton Cattell, Jean Frohlicher, John Jennings, and Angela Giordano-Evans reviewed the paper and provided helpful comments on the first draft. Darrell Mensel typed and retyped the draft.

The work presented herein does not necessarily reflect a policy or position of the College Entrance Examination Board.

## Introduction

"Federally funded vocational education programs have often neglected low-income and handicapped students, shown bias against women, ignored job market trends and provided inferior training and services, the General Accounting Office charged yesterday."

Washington Post
January 18, 1975

"The Vocational Education Act is an exemplary piece of legislation and Congress should extend it . . . and not scrap it because of problems identified."

Representatives of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, as reported in
Higher Education Daily
May 2, 1975

These quotes reflect the diversity of debate that currently surrounds the issue of federal support for vocational education. Interest in vocational education has sharply increased recently, due in part to at least three identifiable factors.

First, the 1974-75 downturn in the economy has had the effect, among other things, of forcing students and educators alike to do some serious rethinking about the value of a liberal arts education. The decrease in the number of job placements for recent college graduates has magnified the question. Although most students and educators would maintain that a broad liberal arts education will always be useful, many are suggesting that both the secondary and postsecondary educational levels should include at least some basic kinds of skill training and career education. Experts are taking a fresh look at vocational education, and many colleges in particular are moving into the area of occupational development.

Second, several studies have recently appeared that seek to evaluate the effectiveness of the vocational education programs administered by the United States Office of Education (OE). These programs are carried out largely by the states and local educational agencies. The federal government and the states together spent $3 billion in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973 in the area of vocational education. At least one such study, by the General Accounting Office (GAO), is sharply critical of federal efforts in this area and has called into question the value of these expenditures.

A third factor that brings vocational education into sharp focus at the present time is the recently held congressional hearings. The Vocational Education Act of 1963 is being reviewed by both houses of Congress prior to its legislative expiration date of June 1976 (although Parts B and C of the act are permanently authorized). The original act, amended several times since its initial passage, seeks to strengthen and improve the quality of vocational education and to expand vocational education opportunities for students of all ages, abilities, and backgrounds. Congress is showing real interest in this legislative renewal process, with the goal of improving the basic Vocational Education Act, rather than drafting totally new legislation.

This brief analysis will: (1) review existing legislation and the U.S. Office of Education administration of the vocational education programs; (2) consider several of the major issues concerning vocational education, whether highlighted by Congress or elsewhere; (3) trace the progress of the congressional hearings to date; and (4) examine possible outcomes.

## Background

### Current legislation

The existing Vocational Education Act is divided basically into 10 parts as follows:[1]

Part A, General Provisions, includes purpose, authorization, programs for students with special needs, and establishment of a national advisory council and state advisory councils.

Part B, State Vocational Education Programs, provides vocational education formula grants to states and is the largest of the programs in operation.

Part C, Research and Training, authorizes 50 percent of the funds directly to states and 50 percent to the commissioner (which he used for career education until fiscal year 1974).

Part D, Exemplary Programs and Projects, allots 50 percent of the monies directly to states for model programs. The commissioner uses his 50 percent for discretionary projects, again largely in the field of career education.

Part E, Residential Vocational Education, authorizes funds for construction and operations and equipment for demonstration schools and grants to reduce borrowing costs for schools and dormitories. This part of the act has never been funded.

Part F, Consumer and Homemaking Education, provides formula grants to states to assist in conducting training programs in home economics not for gainful employment.

Part G, Cooperative Vocational Education, includes formula grants to states for cooperative work-study arrangements.

---

[1] Appendix A on page 44 of this paper describes each of these parts in more detail.

Part H, Work-Study Programs for Vocational Education Students, authorizes state formula grants for work-study programs for full-time vocational education students employed part-time with public employers.

Part I, Curriculum Development in Vocational and Technical Education, provides grants and contracts to assist states and local educational agencies develop new curriculums.

Part J, Bilingual Vocational Training, added to the act in 1974, authorizes grants for bilingual vocational training programs.

Office of Education administration of the programs

The U.S. Office of Education has operated several of these vocational education programs since 1965; others have been authorized more recently. Federal funding for the programs has increased substantially over the years. For example, appropriations for Part B, basic grants to states (by far the largest vocational education program), have increased as shown in the following table of selected years.

**Appropriations for Part B, State Vocational Education Programs**

| Year | Authorization | Appropriation* |
|---|---|---|
| 1965 | $156,641,000 | $156,556,000 |
| 1967 | 252,491,000 | 248,216,000 |
| 1969 | 314,500,000 | 248,216,000 |
| 1971 | 602,500,000 | 315,302,000 |
| 1973 | 508,500,000 | 376,682,000 |
| 1975 | 508,500,000 | 405,347,000 |

SOURCE: U.S. Office of Education Annual Evaluation Report.

*This does not include the permanent authorization and appropriation of $7.1 million to the states each year under the Smith-Hughes Act.

In fiscal year 1973, the latest year for which such data is available, total vocational education expenditures for all programs, including state and local matching funds, exceeded $3 billion. Of that amount only $482 million represented federal expenditures, with the rest of the funds coming from state and local education agencies.

During academic year 1973-74 (fiscal year 1974) a total of 13,556,000 students were enrolled in the various vocational education programs, an increase of nearly 2 million over fiscal year 1972 levels. The Office of Education reported that nearly 8.5 million of these students were at the secondary education level, 1.6 million were considered to be at the postsecondary level, and 3.5 million were adults. The states in their annual reports identified only 1.6 million of these students as being disadvantaged, and 234,115 were classified as handicapped.[2] OE no longer collects participant data by sex or race.

These statistics do not really tell us how well these programs have functioned over the years, whether or not the money has been spent effectively, or whether people have actually benefited from the vocational education they have received. The data also do not indicate what the future directions of vocational education should be.

The Office of Education has undertaken several efforts to evaluate the current vocational education programs.[3] Various OE-sponsored studies have: (1) assessed vocational education programs for handicapped students; (2) compared proprietary- and nonproprietary-school training

---

[2] Appendix B includes tables that show these program statistics in some detail.

[3] Much of the material in this section was obtained from the Office of Education's Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the U.S. Office of Education, FY 1974. This report is prepared annually by OE Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation.

programs; (3) considered problems of career guidance, counseling, and placement for non-college-bound students; and (4) examined the base-year data of the National Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972 in order to identify characteristics of senior vocational-technical students.

None of these studies provides definitive answers to the many questions being raised about vocational education today. However, these OE research and evaluation efforts do provide some data needed to address these questions. For example, one study found that new projects had been established to aid handicapped students through the use of Part B, state programs, set-aside funds. Although cost and outcome data were found to be seriously deficient, available information indicated that handicapped students who were participating in these projects benefited from them. Yet little long-term planning was found at state or local levels, individualized instruction was rare, and teachers were found to be reluctant to accept handicapped students in their vocational classes or unable to instruct them.

Examination of the National Longitudinal Study data determined that vocational high school seniors in 1972 had lower measured academic ability and socioeconomic status than students in general or academic curriculum programs. The comparative study of proprietary and nonproprietary vocational training programs found that investment by students in vocational training was worthwhile and paid off in job opportunities.

Another OE evaluation study has specifically examined the Part G cooperative vocational education program and the Part H work-study program. Both programs were found to be meeting their basic objectives, but the study made negative findings as well. Although cooperative programs were more likely than other types of work education programs to provide in-school students with job-related instruction, job placement,

and occupational counseling services, they were also more likely to segregate job placements by sex, to interfere with students' other activities both in and out of school, and to be less effective in reducing student absenteeism. Work-study vocational education programs were found to keep students in school and to improve student attitudes toward both school and work. But little attempt was made to offer related classwork to work-study students. Most such students were found to be working in unskilled and clerical jobs. The evaluation pointed out that work-study students seemed to be working primarily for money, while cooperative education students were working for the occupational training provided by their jobs.

Project Baseline, an ongoing four-year study of vocational education, has found that women are offered limited training options in vocational education. The study estimated that although women made up approximately 55 percent of all vocational education enrollments in 1972 (and two-thirds of secondary education enrollments), they were concentrated in office occupations, health programs, and non-wage-earning home economics programs.

Although these various studies suggest problems with current vocational education programs, clearly much more needs to be known about vocational education and the impact of these federal dollars on students, including their educational and employment outcomes. OE is continuing its analysis of the longitudinal study data base as subsequent follow-up studies of these students are completed.

The National Institute of Education also contracted for a study that concluded that as few as 20 percent of vocational education graduates trained in fields such as accounting and computer technology found related work. Graduates in other fields were more likely to find jobs related to their training, but the work was often low paying. Income differences by race and sex of graduates

were found. This study has been criticized by the American Vocational Association (AVA) and the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) but defended by its author, W.W. Wilms of the University of California at Berkeley.

Substantially more controversy and debate has surrounded a recent study completed by the General Accounting Office. In 1974 the GAO reviewed the operation of the federal vocational education programs in seven states. Its report stated that although vocational education enrollments and expenditures had indeed grown since 1963, the use of federal funds has not been adequately evaluated at federal, state, or local levels. Large amounts of federal funds have been retained at the state level for administrative purposes. Although state and local governments have increased their funding for vocational education programs, the study found in some states that the ratio of state and local support to federal support had declined.

The GAO report noted that greater attention to systematic and coordinated planning at all levels would improve the use of federal monies and insure that vocational education is directed toward student and community needs. Vocational education students often are enrolled in traditional courses and are not always able to find employment in fields for which they have been trained, according to the study. Realistic assessment of labor market supply and demand is needed, stated the GAO, as well as work experience for vocational education students, occupational guidance, and better job placement by schools. The study noted that age, sex, and entrance requirements have proven to be barriers to training and employment.

State vocational education directors accused the GAO report of being overly negative, sometimes inaccurate, and guilty of "clouding the value" of vocational education and its future. OE stated that the study had substantiated problems of concern to OE and concurred with

many of its recommendations.[4] However, OE officials pointed out analytical weaknesses in the report and sought to put the study in perspective by pointing out some of the positive accomplishments of the federal vocational education programs.

Questions about the effectiveness, efficiency, and long-term benefits of vocational education persist, despite these various studies and evaluations. It is against this background that we now turn to a discussion of the current issues being debated, focusing on operational questions in the federal vocational education programs, but considering some of the broader problems as well.

## Current issues

Most of those who are concerned with the problems facing vocational education and the operation of the federal vocational education programs deplore the fact that barriers still exist for women, for minorities, and for the poor in these programs. However, there is less than unanimous agreement on what the remaining current issues in this area are, on how they are defined, and on what the alternatives are for solution to the problems they raise. The following list includes most, but not necessarily all, of the other issues that are currently being debated.

### Percentage allotment of funds

Present law, Part B, requires states to allot at least 15 percent of these vocational education funds for postsecondary-level programs, 15 percent for programs for disadvantaged students, and 10 percent for handicapped students. Several questions have been raised about

[4] Discussion of the GAO legislation recommendations can be found on page 36.

these percentage allotments. Should postsecondary-level programs receive more than 15 percent of these funds? Community colleges and four-year institutions have maintained that they are substantially involved in vocational education at the postsecondary level and therefore should get a larger share of these state program funds. Postsecondary-level vocational educators argue about exactly how high the percentage allotment should be, but most agree it should be greater than the current 15 percent. Vocational educators at the secondary level have mixed reactions to this issue, some agreeing that postsecondary vocational education should get more money, but few willing to give up secondary-level vocational funds to permit this.

A closely related question in the percentage allotment issue deals only with the postsecondary-level share of these Part B funds. What should be the split in postsecondary-level funds between different types of institutions? Community and junior colleges maintain that they educate the most vocational students at the postsecondary level, offering a wide variety of occupational courses. They believe, therefore, that they should receive the majority of the Part B postsecondary funds. Four-year colleges, on the other hand, say that they are also providing a wide range of vocational offerings for their students, and they don't agree with the claim of the two-year schools to the majority of these funds.

A final issue under this category of percentage allotments relates to the percentage set aside for disadvantaged- and handicapped-student programs. The GAO report, using OE data, noted that in fiscal year 1973 14 states spent less than 15 percent of their Part B funds on programs for the disadvantaged while an additional 12 states only spent between 15 and 16 percent of their funds for this purpose. In the same fiscal year, 14 states spent less than 10 percent on pro-

grams for handicapped students, and 16 more states spent less than 11 percent. The GAO report concedes that current legislation permits states to spend any fiscal year allotment over a two-year period. Therefore, the states included in the figures above are not necessarily operating illegally. However, it is clear that many states are not giving high priority to programs for persons with special needs. The issue remains--what can be done about this problem?

## Program consolidation

The President's fiscal year 1976 budget for vocational education contained a new proposal. The new budget recommended that the vocational education categorical programs, with the exception of Part B, state programs, be consolidated under a new "Innovation" title that would encourage the development of nontraditional programs and other national priorities. Programs for students with special needs, consumer and homemaking education, work-study, cooperative education, and bilingual training would no longer be separately funded.[5]

Since this budget request appeared in January, debate has been heated on the merits of retaining or eliminating the vocational education categorical programs. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) argued that "excessive categorization of Federal programs has caused States to design programs tailored to meet those categories rather than to meet needs that actually exist." Others maintained that the categorical programs meet special needs that would go unfulfilled unless funds were directed specifically for these purposes. The issue remains unresolved at this time.

---

[5]This budget proposal has since been included in the Administration's vocational education bill, discussed on page 26.

Office of Education program administration

Several different questions exist about the broad issue of OE program administration. For example, to what extent should OE monitor the state plans, required by law, for spending federal and state funds in order to insure that such plans are actually carried out? How closely should OE check state spending for percentage set-aside categories such as the portions of Part B funds for the disadvantaged and the handicapped? Should the OE commissioner have use of some amount of discretionary funds in order to carry out program priorities identified at the national level? Should OE monitor the amount and use of federal funds at the state level? The GAO report raised a number of these questions, suggesting that federal vocational education funds had not played a "catalytic" role in the states and that it was up to OE to monitor the federal funds to insure that this effect actually occurred. HEW maintained that OE funds were indeed catalytic but agreed that OE should help identify and disseminate strategies for providing vocational education programs that were catalytic.

Career education

Career education has been described as an "essential companion" to vocational education. The Office of Education in a recent policy paper has defined the concept of career education as "the totality of experiences through which one learns about and prepares to engage in work as part of his or her way of living." This kind of broad definition leads to confusion on the part of some who fail to see the essential differences between career education and vocational education. Others argue strongly that there are essential differences between the two concepts, that the career education thrust has come as a response to a call for educational reform,

and that it is a developmental concept meant to begin in the very early years and continue well into retirement. The education amendments of 1974 adopted the concept of career education, setting up the National Advisory Council for Career Education (NACCE) (separate from the National Advisory Council for Vocational Education, NACVE) and a separate Office of Career Education (with its own funds) within the Office of Education. In addition, Part B, Title X of the Higher Education Act as amended in 1972, authorizes $850 million for occupational education programs to encourage occupational preparation, guidance, counseling, and job placement at both the federal and state levels. These programs have never been funded.

Thus, at this time of legislative renewal for vocational education, the question has been raised as to what the place of career education is in these activities. Are the concepts different and if so how? Should the career education concept be integrated into federal vocational programs and if so how?

What should be the role of guidance and counseling?

Should guidance and counseling activities be assumed under the vocational education programs, or should they be emphasized separately? The close relationship between guidance and career education was formally recognized recently when the American Personnel and Guidance Association (APGA) adopted a statement encouraging its members to support career education and to identify and implement career development activities. Yet the GAO report noted that the Vocational Education Act already included provisions for guidance services to assist students in selecting career objectives. The GAO charged that "these services did not appear to be adequate in many of the schools visited. . . . In fact, students generally did not receive vocational guidance and

counseling unless they made a specific request." Several other reports, including one completed by the NACVE have focused on needed change in guidance and counseling areas. The extent of such possible changes and their final form are the basic issues at the present time.

Other current issues

A number of other questions have been raised during the current debate on vocational education that should be noted here. One, for example, relates to the composition of state boards for vocational education. These boards are required by law and are responsible for administration of the state vocational education plan. This problem is related to the question discussed earlier about percentage allotments of funds by educational sector and institutional type. The question is, should the membership of state vocational education boards be altered to include more representatives of postsecondary vocational education? Should there be, as an alternative, a separate board to represent postsecondary interests? Arguments continue back and forth on this issue, with some maintaining that the existing boards and their membership are adequate and representative. Others say this is not so, but some worry about proliferating boards, authorities, and responsibilities. Their concern is related in part to Section 1202 of the education amendments of 1972 which authorized state commissions responsible for comprehensive postsecondary education planning. A related question here, raised by the GAO report, asks whether or not there should be a limited or a specific set-aside on state use of vocational education funds for administrative purposes at the state level.

A second issue has come into debate as a result of the submission to Congress of the Administration's vocational education legislation. The question is what should be the funding authorization levels in the vocational education legislation? Some heated discussion

on this question has taken place largely between the Congress and the Administration since the OE bill includes a lower level of authorizations than is in effect under existing law. This issue is discussed in more detail later.

A final issue that must be included in this section is that of construction. To what extent should future construction be funded under the Vocational Education Act, and what kinds of construction should be included, if any? Should renovation of existing facilities be encouraged or new construction or both? In fiscal year 1973 over $228 million were committed under Part B, state programs, for 368 area vocational school construction projects. Of this amount, $35.4 million were from federal Vocational Education Act funds. The GAO report recommended that the use of such funds for construction be discouraged except where needs have been thoroughly explored and documented. Some have suggested that Part B funds previously used for construction purposes be rechanneled into the broad area of post-secondary vocational education, thus meeting the criticism that there is no additional money available to meet demands for expansion of postsecondary vocational education activities. Construction under the Vocational Education Act remains an important question.

The next section of this paper considers the recent series of congressional hearings on vocational education and examines the issues discussed here in the context of legislation that has been introduced before both the House and Senate.

## Congressional hearings

### Organization

The organization of the recent series of hearings on vocational education legislation renewal in the House and Senate was somewhat unusual. House Elementary, Secondary and Vocational Education Sub-

committee Chairman Carl Perkins and ranking minority member Albert Quie agreed that the hearings in the House on vocational education would be broadly representative of a wide range of viewpoints. To that end they introduced a number of different vocational education bills, sponsored by different interest groups. Extensive hearings were then scheduled on all these differing bills, with witnesses testifying as to the merits and faults of each. This procedure adapted by Perkins and Quie differed from that of Postsecondary Subcommittee Chairman James O'Hara. He had already held a series of hearings during 1974 on higher education legislation, which is also up for renewal at the same time as the Vocational Education Act. This year Representative O'Hara introduced his own version of a higher education bill (in two parts) and, as of this time, he has only conducted hearings on his own piece of legislation.[6] Alternative higher education bills have not as yet been introduced.

Since the structure of the House education subcommittees separates vocational education from higher education, the two areas under the legislative renewal process have been kept separate so far. Indeed it is likely that separate legislation for vocational education and higher education will be considered by the full Education and and Labor Committee.

A different arrangement exists in the Senate where the Education Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is responsible for all levels and types of education legislation. As a result, Senate Education Subcommittee Chairman Claiborne Pell has conducted

---

[6]Representative O'Hara split his higher education legislation into two parts, one bill amending the student aid portions of the Higher Education Act (Title IV) and the second providing a simple reauthorization of all other titles of the Higher Education Act.

hearings on both vocational education and higher education, scheduling much less testimony in each area than was heard in the House. Senator Pell, together with ranking minority member Senator J. Glenn Beall, expects one omnibus bill including both vocational education and higher education to come out of his subcommittee for the consideration of the full committee and the entire Senate.

However, in the specific area of vocational education the Senate has followed the same procedure as the Perkins subcommittee. Senators Pell and Beall have introduced the identical wide range of differing vocational education bills in the Senate. Hearings were conducted on the merits of each, rather than following Representative O'Hara's procedure in the House.

## The interested parties

Groups that can be described as interested parties to the process of vocational education legislation renewal are divided basically into two types, those that have sponsored bills introduced in the House and Senate and those that have not. Those that have bills include the AVA, the AACJC, the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC), the Administration, and the APGA (dealing mainly with guidance and counseling). Those who are bystanders but who have real interests in vocational education legislation include the National Advisory Council for Vocational Education, the National Advisory Council for Career Education, the AFL-CIO, the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU), and the GAO, among others. Most of these groups, either with or without bills, have testified before the House or Senate subcommittees (or both). Major and minor differences remain among their positions on the direction and content of future vocational education legislation.

The various bills and some reactions to them

The following paragraphs describe each of the bills briefly, noting in particular how each addresses the current issues in vocational education.[7]

The AVA bill, H.R. 3037 and S. 941. Basically, legislation proposed by the AVA would have the effect of increasing state responsibility for administration and management, while increasing federal funding levels and eliminating state matching requirements.

Specifically the AVA bill addresses the issue of percentage allotments by increasing the amount of Part B funds to be set aside for postsecondary vocational education (and adult education) from 15 percent in the present law to 30 percent. No mention is made about how these funds should be divided among different types of post-secondary institutions. The present requirement that 15 percent of these Part B funds be used for the disadvantaged is retained in the AVA bill. However, the current 10 percent set aside for handicapped students is amended by requiring that 10 percent of the monies remaining after the 15 percent is set aside for the disadvantaged be used for this purpose. This 10 percent set aside for handicapped students, as well as the 15 percent for disadvantaged students, can also be met by counting funds expended for such students under two other parts of the act.

An important part of the AVA bill that relates indirectly to this same issue is that it repeals the requirement that states match federal dollars 50-50 for the basic state programs. The AVA bill also repeals state maintenance of effort requirements. Given the fact

[7] Some of the material in this section was derived from legislative summaries prepared by Angela Giordano-Evans of the Library of Congress, Congressional Research Service.

that states spent almost six dollars of their own plus local funds for every one dollar of federal support in fiscal year 1973, thereby overmatching the federal dollars considerably, it is puzzling what the purpose or possible impact might be of repealing the simple 50-50 matching requirement for Part B funds.

The AVA bill consolidates some vocational education programs while setting up new categories of others. For example, present law includes separate categorical programs for residential vocational education (Part E), home economics (Part F), and cooperative education (Part G). In this bill these programs are consolidated into the basic state grant program. Present law also contains a separate authorization for special programs for disadvantaged persons (Part A). This program would be repealed by the AVA bill. A new separate section, "Vocational Education Program Services", would authorize grants to states for teacher education, placement and follow-up, and student support programs, each with a separate authorization. By contrast, the present legislation authorizes separate teacher education and student work-study programs, while permitting states to use their basic state grant funds (Part B) for job placement.

It should be noted that teacher education is presently authorized under the Education Professions Development Act (EPDA) but is included in the AVA's vocational education bill. Also consolidated into the AVA's vocational education legislation are the leadership development awards program and the institute and leadership education programs from EPDA (although with amendments) and the research and training programs (current Part C), curriculum development (current Part I), and exemplary programs (current Part D).

The AVA bill responds to several questions about OE program administration. For example, OE would have fewer state plans to review. Instead of submitting annual and five-year plans to OE as required

now, states would submit plans once every two years in a new comprehensive planning process. These plans would consist of recommendations for four to six years (reported by fiscal year). The state board would also submit to OE an annual report on receipt and distribution of federal funds.

While OE would review fewer plans, it would still have specific monitoring responsibilities. The bill has a somewhat unusual section that requires the Bureau of Occupational and Adult Education (BOAE) to provide leadership to state vocational education agencies in expanding and improving vocational education programs. The bill would require OE to assign adequate staff to the bureau to carry out this function.

OE monitoring of the programs might also be improved by a section in the bill that requires state boards to present an accountability report to OE every two years indicating the extent to which they had attained their goals. Funds are authorized to assist states in their comprehensive planning process.

Career education and its role in vocational education is addressed directly in this bill. Added to the legislation's declaration of purpose is the authority to develop new programs of career guidance and exploration. Specifically, this bill would authorize new grants that would be available to states for preservice and inservice career educational personnel development, acquisition and development of prevocational curriculum materiai and equipment, and finally services related to career center operations such as new vocational guidance programs and exchanges between schools and the business community.

Vocational guidance and counseling would no longer be funded under basic state grants (Part B) but could be funded to some extent under this new career guidance program.

Looking at the other current issues facing vocational education,

the AVA wants one state board of vocational education to be designated as the sole agency for administering the state plan and for supervision of local educational agency administration. Present law requires each state to designate the state board as responsible for the state plan or for local administration, but not necessarily for both.

Authorization levels are increased in many cases in this bill. For example, for state basic grants programs $842.5 million would be authorized for fiscal year 1976, increasing to $1,136 million in fiscal year 1980. Current law includes a permanent authorization of $565 million for these grants for each fiscal year.

Construction of vocational education facilities would be permitted under the AVA legislation.

The AACJC bill, H.R. 3036 and S. 939. The major feature of this bill is that it separates the administration of vocational education programs at the secondary school level from those at the postsecondary school level.

In particular, the AACJC legislation would make significant changes in the percentage allotment of funds for vocational education. Funds are to be split between "vocational education," defined as being at the secondary level, and "occupational education," which would include all programs at the postsecondary level. For the basic state grant program a new percentage allotment system is incorporated in the AACJC bill. Vocational education at the secondary level would receive 40 percent of the funds in each state. Of these monies, up to 75 percent would be for secondary schools other than area vocational secondary schools. As in the present law, 15 percent of the secondary-level set-aside funds would be for the disadvantaged, and 10 percent for the handicapped. (The current 15 percent set aside for those who have left or finished high school remains in this bill but is an apparent drafting error.) In addition, up to 5 percent of these

secondary monies could be used for administration of the state plan and up to 15 percent for guidance, counseling, technical assistance, and ancillary services.

A second 40 percent of these basic state grant funds would be allotted to postsecondary occupational education. The AACJC bill not only increases the postsecondary set-aside but also specifies that 75 percent of these monies may be used only for programs and activities carried out by community colleges. The intent of the AACJC is to retain the 15 percent and 10 percent set-asides for programs for the disadvantaged and handicapped in these postsecondary-level (40 percent) monies, but this intent is not spelled out in the AACJC bill.

The final 20 percent of these basic state grant funds can be used by the state to supplement either its vocational education or occupational education activities or both. A newly established State Board for Allotment of Federal Vocational Funds has the authority in each state to decide on the distribution of this 20 percent.

In addressing the issue of program consolidation the AACJC bill would consolidate some programs and eliminate others. For example, existing law would be amended by consolidating research and training (Part C), exemplary programs (Part D), and curriculum development (Part I) into a new section titled "Improvement of Vocational and Occupational Education." Funds available under this new consolidated section would be split evenly between OE and the states. Both federal and state funds must be expended evenly by purpose, with at least 20 percent for applied research, 20 percent for improvement projects, and 20 percent for curriculum development.

The AACJC bill neither extends nor amends the residential vocational education (Part E), consumer and homemaking (Part F), coopera-

tive education (Part G), work-study (Part H), or bilingual vocational education (Part J) programs. The program for students with special needs is retained.

Although this bill does not deal directly with the question of OE program administration, suggested uses listed in the bill for occupational education funds include enabling the state to initiate and conduct a comprehensive program of planning for the establishment of their occupational education program. The state plan for occupational education must be prepared by the state 1202 commission rather than by the state board for vocational education.

The role of career education and guidance and counseling is also not addressed specifically by the AACJC bill. However, authorized planning activities in each state include the development of a long-range strategy for putting occupational education (including general orientation, counseling and guidance, and placement either in a job or in postsecondary occupational programs) on an equal footing with traditional academic education. Occupational education grants can be made for, among other purposes, the design, establishment, and conduct of programs that include methods of providing follow-up services and career counseling and guidance for persons of all ages as a regular function of the educational system.

On the issue of state vocational education boards, it was noted earlier that the AACJC bill gives planning responsibility for occupational (postsecondary) education to the state 1202 commission. This bill also authorizes the establishment of a state agency (which may be the state board of vocational education if the governor of a state determines that it is adequately representative of occupational educators) to have sole responsibility for fiscal management and admin-

istration of the occupational education program. Thus, it would be possible but not required for two separate boards (agencies) to be set up under this bill, one for vocational education (secondary level) and one for occupational education (postsecondary level). In addition, the AACJC measure would establish local coordinating committees to assess the need for vocational, occupational, and manpower training programs in each area and to develop strategies to meet these needs.

On the question of authorization levels, this bill would simply extend existing authorization levels through 1980.

Construction is not directly mentioned in this bill. The residential vocational education program, included in current legislation (Part E) but never funded, is dropped in this bill. States may, as part of their occupational education program, lease, rent, or remodel facilities required to carry out their program.

The NASULGC bill, H.R. 4797 and S. 942. This measure is similar in many ways to the AACJC bill, emphasizing postsecondary occupational education. The NASULGC measure divides the basic state grant program into two areas--secondary vocational education and postsecondary occupational education--as does the AACJC measure. Forty percent of the funds are set aside for secondary vocational education, 40 percent for postsecondary occupational education, and the remaining 20 percent is to be split between the two areas. Of the 40 percent reserved for the secondary level, 10 percent must be set aside for handicapped students and 15 percent for disadvantaged students.

However, there are some key differences in the NASULGC bill. Of the 40 percent set aside for postsecondary occupational education, the NASULGC bill does not require that 75 percent of these monies be reserved for community colleges, as does the AACJC bill. Instead, this bill provides that this 40 percent would be available to all

postsecondary programs within a state, with no amount reserved for any one type of institution.[8] Further, the NASULGC differs from other proposals in that it puts forth a clearly defined purpose for these postsecondary funds, that of promotion of access to occupational education programs in each state. The NASULGC maintained in its testimony that the AVA and AACJC proposals provided for the use of federal funds "that are so general in scope and so vague in nature that state agencies and institutions cannot be accountable for their expenditure of Federal funds." The bill's provisions apply to part-time as well as to full-time students. Finally, this bill includes the requirement that 10 percent of these postsecondary funds be set aside for the handicapped and 15 percent for the disadvantaged. Included is the requirement that any state's postsecondary occupational education allotment shall pay for not more than 50 percent of the total expenditures made in carrying out any planning or administration that may be necessary for the use of these funds.

For the remaining 20 percent of these basic state grant monies the NASULGC bill provides that each state must set up a procedure for a joint award determination by the state vocational education board and the state 1202 commission. It does not, however, specifically identify such a procedure, as the AACJC bill does.

Unlike the AVA proposal, but like the AACJC measure, this bill continues the 50-50 state matching requirements for all three portions of these state grant funds.

The NASULGC bill does not propose to consolidate any of the

---

[8] It should be noted that subsequent to the introduction of this legislation, NASULGC has proposed that the 40-percent funds reserved for postsecondary occupational education must be spent on programs conducted in postsecondary occupational education institutions. NASULGC has also proposed that federal funds be authorized to defray the "extra cost" of postsecondary occupational education programs.

various vocational education programs authorized under current law. It only amends each part (C through J) by inserting after "vocational education," wherever this term appears, the phrase "and postsecondary occupational education."

This bill also does not deal directly with the question of OE program administration. Requirements for state-level planning and evaluation are spelled out, however.

The role of career education and guidance and counseling is not spelled out in this proposal. However, in describing possible state programs that might be used to promote access to postsecondary occupational education, the bill identifies, among other possibilities, "programs of inservice training, for guidance and counseling personnel serving in elementary and secondary schools in order to familiarize such personnel with opportunities afforded by postsecondary occupational education."

The portions of the NASULGC bill that relate to state boards are similar to those in the AACJC measure. That is, the 1202 commission in each state would be responsible for planning the use of postsecondary occupational education funds received. The state board of vocational education would be responsible for planning and administering secondary vocational education funds. Responsibility for administering the postsecondary occupational education funds could lie with the state vocational education board, the 1202 commission, or some other agency designated by the state.

Authorization levels are not discussed in the NASULGC bill, nor is the question of construction.

The Administration's bill, H.R. 6251 and S. 1863. The basic feature of the Administration's proposal is expressed at the very beginning: "to consolidate existing authorities under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 in order to create a more efficient mechanism for Federal

assistance to States for vocational education." The bill seeks to focus federal assistance in this area. In testimony before the Senate, OE Commissioner Bell described the bill as addressing five goals: (1) continuation of Part B basic state grant programs; (2) simplification of state and local administration of federal funds; (3) increased emphasis on persons with special needs; (4) developing an "adequate response" to problems including inadequate planning, identified in the GAO report; and (5) limiting federal vocational education funds for program maintenance and increasing funds available for innovation and new program development.

The Administration's bill does not specify any particular amounts to be set aside under the basic state program section. However, the bill does stipulate that a state's annual program plan must provide assurances that not less than 25 percent of these basic state grant funds will be used for persons with special needs.[9] The term "persons with special needs" is defined in the bill as those "who are or have been adversely affected by physical, mental, academic, socioeconomic, geographic, or other factors and conditions, and who require special supportive, educational, or guidance assistance in order to benefit from vocational education programs and services." In effect this legislative language would consolidate the 10 percent set aside for the handicapped and the 15 percent set aside for the disadvantaged in the present law and put them into the state planning document, rather than requiring them under the direct authorization of funds for Part B programs. The 15 percent set aside for postsecondary vocational education is eliminated, and no specific expenditures for any particular type or group of institutions are mandated by this bill. This represents

[9]This 25 percent set-aside requirement also applies to innovation funds described on pages 28 and 29.

a major difference from the previous bills discussed in this section.

An additional feature of the Administration's bill that is indirectly related to this issue is the provision for a single state allocation formula, patterned after the existing Part B formula. The bill proposes that this single formula be used for all funds allocated to states. Current legislation includes four different allocation formulas for existing programs.

A final point to be noted in this general area is that the bill changes the current 50-50 federal-state matching requirements for the basic state grant program (and others that are consolidated into the program -- see below) to a 40-percent federal, 60-percent state and local matching requirement. This is quite a different approach from that advocated in the AVA bill, which would eliminate state matching requirements altogether.

The major focus of the Administration's bill is program consolidation, putting into legislation what had been already proposed, in part, in the President's fiscal year 1976 budget. OE wanted to simplify program administration and argued that this could best be accomplished by removing some of the specific authorizations in existing law and consolidating the authorized expenditures and program purposes into as few parts as possible.

Specifically, the Administration's proposal groups all the existing vocational education categorical programs into two broad titles, one described as "Vocational Education Programs and Services," and the second called "Grants for Research, Innovation or Demonstration." The programs and services category would include the existing Part B state programs as well as home economics programs, work experience programs such as cooperative education, vocational education personnel development and training, and the implementation of projects and activities that prove effective under the innovation

grants program. Additional services that would also be available under this new title include vocational guidance and counseling, equipping and operating area vocational technical schools, planning activities, data acquisition and dissemination, personnel exchange programs, placement and follow-up of vocational education graduates, and work-study programs operated by a local education agency or other public agency or institution.

The new consolidated grants program for research, innovation, and demonstration would provide funds to the states, with no matching requirements for research, developmental programs, new curriculum development, demonstration programs, and evaluation. Activities receiving funds under this section must meet: (1) needs set forth in the state's 5-year plan; and (2) one or more of the national critical needs or priorities established by the OE commissioner; or (3) one or more of the eight objectives listed in the bill. Only three years of funding would be provided to any of these activities unless the state board determines a fourth year is necessary.

Fifty percent of the funds available for the broad area of innovation would be directed to states. The remaining 50 percent of the funds in this category would be available to the OE commissioner for grants and contracts in these general areas.

It is important here to note the relative levels of funding authorized for these two new consolidated titles because they demonstrate the emphasis the Administration wished to place on innovation. OE estimated in recent testimony that the Vocational Education Act allocated only about 8 percent of the available funds to those parts of the act devoted to innovation, demonstration, and program development. The Administration's new proposal, according to OE, would allocate approximately one-third of the total vocational education appropriation for this purpose.

The questions relating to OE administration of the vocational education programs are addressed in several ways in this proposal. For example, a new title would be added, "Annual Assessment of National Vocational Education Needs and Priorities." This portion of the Administration's bill seeks to strengthen federal, state, and local planning. A strengthened 5-year plan is required of states for the use of all vocational education funds. In addition, states must submit a new annual program plan, providing detailed descriptions of how all federal funds will be spent. The idea here is to enable OE to better monitor state plans and the allocation of federal funds. Federal funds are explicitly authorized for carrying out planning functions in the states, which is not true in existing law. The Administration's bill would require that the OE commissioner annually conduct an assessment of the status of vocational education, looking in particular at critical national needs and areas of high priority. This published document, together with data on manpower needs to be provided by the Department of Labor, is designed to assist states and local areas in their planning for long-range vocational education needs.

The Administration's bill does not clearly spell out the role of career education. Guidance and counseling activities, however, are included as activities funded under the new programs and services title. Also, the purpose of the legislation is amended to include, among other items, the provision of vocational guidance, counseling, and placement.

The Administration's proposal differs from the AACJC and NASULGC bills on the subject of state boards. In testimony, OE argued that the AACJC and NASULGC proposals "would promote reduced cooperation and limit coordinated planning at the State level." Instead this bill continues the existing concept of a sole state agency that is responsible for planning and coordination. This agency can, however, delegate responsibility for operation and supervision of the vocational education

programs to other state agencies as deemed appropriate. The membership on state advisory councils for vocational education is also strengthened to include more representatives of postsecondary vocational education.

Perhaps the issue that has raised the most controversy about the Administration's bill is that of authorization levels for the various programs. The bill includes authorizations of $4.3 million for state advisory councils, $358.7 for basic state grants and other programs consolidated into the new programs and services title, and $160 million for research, innovation, and demonstration. Representative Quie, in remarks made on the floor of the House, pointed out that this proposed annual authorization total of $523 million should be compared to authorization under existing legislation adding up to $964.5 million, including Part F of the Education Professions Development Act. This proposed authorization is also lower than current appropriations for these programs.

The Administration's bill proposes that funds utilized for construction purposes under existing legislation be transferred to the program and services title. Commissioner Bell argued in Senate testimony that further vocational education facilities construction should become a state and local responsibility. The bill, therefore, repeals the authority for any new construction.

Extension of existing legislation, H.R. 19, H.R. 20, and S. 943. In addition to introducing the various vocational education bills drafted by the AVA, AACJC, NASULGC, and the Administration, both Representative Perkins and Senator Pell have introduced legislation that would simply extend the existing Vocational Education Act without substantive amendment.

Under the provisions of H.R. 19 and H.R. 20 the various programs would be extended through fiscal year 1982. Authorization levels for Part B, state programs, and Part C, research and training, would be

increased from $565 million to $1 billion in each year. In addition, $100 million is authorized for disadvantaged programs under Part A. Parts D, E, F, G, H, and I would be extended at their present levels of authorization. Part J, bilingual vocational education, is neither amended nor extended by these bills.

S. 943 is the Senate version of extension legislation for vocational education. It continues the existing vocational education programs through fiscal year 1980, two years less than the House proposal. Current program authorization levels are not changed in this proposal, also in contrast to the House measure. Part J, bilingual education, is extended by the Senate bill.

The APGA career guidance and counseling bill, H.R. 3270 and S. 940.

A proposal that does not address all areas of vocational education but should be mentioned here is that of the APGA. The basic focus of this specialized legislation is to provide for career guidance and counseling plans and programs for states and local educational agencies. Since this bill relates specifically to the issues of the roles of career education and guidance and counseling, only a brief summary of the measure is included here.

The APGA bill establishes an Office of Career Guidance and Counseling in OE and a National Advisory Council on Career Guidance that would be responsible for conducting a survey of the current status of career guidance programs and materials.

The new Office of Career Guidance and Counseling would administer a program of grants to states (those that have submitted approved plans for these funds). Such grants can be retained at the state level for state education agency activities in this area or may be distributed to local education agencies. Grants may be used for a wide variety of activities, including initiation and expansion of professional career guidance and counseling programs, training in career decision-making,

job placement, special counseling for handicapped, early retirees and others, supportive media, and equipment and exemplary programs.

A second program of contracts to postsecondary education institutions, states, and local educational agencies is authorized that would provide for training and retraining of guidance personnel.

The OE commissioner is also authorized in this APGA bill to carry out a program of demonstration and evaluation. This program would seek to develop new guidance and counseling techniques, promote pilot projects, and evaluate programs and services.

Finally, the bill provides for a program of grants to states and postsecondary institutions to obtain and maintain facilities and equipment for career information and development.

Other recommendations

Other groups that do not have bills introduced in the Congress but have either made recommendations for vocational education legislation or testified during congressional hearings include the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, the National Advisory Council on Career Education, the AFL-CIO, AASCU, and the American Council on Education (ACE). The public positions of each of these groups are described briefly in the following paragraphs.

NACVE. The basic position of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education is that the general purpose and format of the existing Vocational Education Act should be retained, with revisions made as necessary.

In testimony before the Senate on April 11, 1975 the NACVE representatives stated that they did not approve of proposals that would separate vocational funding into two separate blocs (secondary and postsecondary). Instead, NACVE argued that "distribution of funds between secondary and postsecondary programs should find

its own level within each State." They recommended increasing the postsecondary set-aside from the current 15 percent to a 25 percent minimum and suggested that a similar 25 percent floor for secondary programs be provided. This would prevent a state from using all of its Part B funds for either secondary of postsecondary vocational education. NACVE recommended to Congress that the current set-asides for programs for disadvantaged and handicapped students be retained at current levels. In addition they suggested that these particular set-asides be specifically matched with equal amounts of state and local funds. It was pointed out that in many states such a requirement would double the amount of money available for such programs.

On the issue of program consolidation, NACVE representatives rejected the idea that consolidation along broader lines is needed. They maintained, instead, that the act as written is "an outstanding example of consolidated legislation." They noted that current law permitted broad latitude on the part of states in the use of federal dollars. Yet the act still contains specific sections that identified and supported specific national priorities, which only account for less than one-fourth of total federal vocational education funding.

NACVE representatives recommended greater review and evaluation of vocational education programs by the Office of Education, stating that such review should be carried out in Washington, not in the OE regional offices. They pointed out the importance of state plans as a planning mechanism and urged that state planning be improved. NACVE testified that although state agencies must perform self-evaluations of the progress of state plans, OE must "initially review and evaluate the long-range plan against the requirements and intent of the legislation." OE must then evaluate the annual state reports to see that state revisions do not alter the plan in terms

of federal intent or priorities. NACVE recognized the importance of evaluations done by state advisory councils on vocational education.

NACVE representatives spoke directly to the role of career education. While endorsing the concept, they pointed out that career education and vocational education should not be considered synonymous. "We see career education," they stated, "as an all encompassing concept, and vocational education as one of various equal component programs within that concept. Career education is the facilitator which will help bring about the integration and cooperation required for a more effective educational system. Career education is not a substitute for vocational education." They recommended that separate legislative authority and funding be maintained for career education as is currently provided in the education amendments of 1974.

NACVE representatives noted that they had published a report in 1972 titled Counseling and Guidance: A Call for Change. This study recommended that Congress authorize categorical funding for counseling and guidance in all legislation requiring these services. In Senate testimony NACVE recommended that any vocational education funds used for counseling should be used specifically for the training of counselors in areas related to vocational education and job opportunities, rather than for general expansion of counseling programs.

NACVE proposed that the concept of a single state agency be retained in the present legislation, arguing that effective vocational education planning could not be carried out in the states if the funds were to be administered by competing agencies. The issues of overall authorization levels for vocational education legislation and construction were not addressed by NACVE.

NACCE. In testimony before the House and Senate subcommittees, Sidney P. Marland, chairman of the National Advisory Council on Career Education, expressed the Council's support for the advancement of vocational

education legislation, although he urged caution lest the confusion between vocational education and career education be aggravated. His testimony did not address the legislative issues of percentage set-asides, program consolidation, or federal and state administration of the vocational education programs, but described the relationship between American higher learning and occupational development. "Simply stated, career education seeks to integrate and harmonize the two, giving purpose and useful outcomes to learning." On behalf of NACCE he suggested the need for federal resources to encourage faculty development, curriculum reform, and the linking of business, industry, and labor more closely with higher education, and to expand career counseling and placement services of colleges and universities.

NACCE is currently reviewing the career education provisions that are explicitly and implicitly woven into existing law and is considering whether to propose, on the one hand, a major amendment to current legislation or, on the other hand, a separate legislative thrust for career education.

GAO. In its report to the Congress on the role of federal assistance for vocational education, the GAO made a number of legislative recommendations.

The report did not directly address the issue of percentage set-asides for secondary and postsecondary vocational education. However, the GAO did suggest two options for providing programs and services for the disadvantaged and handicapped. The first option, as suggested by the GAO, would require states to match federal set-asides for disadvantaged and handicapped students at the same level they are required to match regular Part B funds (50-50), thereby insuring state and local involvement in and commitment to these efforts. This option is similar to the one suggested by the NACVE. The second option suggested by the GAO would be simply to increase the percentage of the

set-asides for these special needs categories. In addition, the GAO suggested that a new set-aside requirement be adopted. This would establish cooperative arrangements in order to expand vocational offerings and strengthen programs through the use of other public training facilities or nonpublic training resources.

The GAO report did not make specific legislative recommendations in the area of program consolidation. It addressed the issue of program administration indirectly, by making several suggestions concerning the use of federal funds at the state level. The report overall was especially concerned with the problem of insuring that federal funds play a catalytic role at the state level.

The study did not make specific legislative recommendations concerning career education or guidance and counseling. Authorization levels for the vocational education programs are also not addressed, but the report does recommend establishing, as a legislative policy, that federal funds will not be used for construction except in instances in which there is adequate justification for additional facilities after thorough consideration of alternatives.

AFL-CIO. The AFL-CIO representatives, in testimony before the House, stated their belief that the Vocational Education Act has been one of the most successful of all federal programs in the field of education.

In considering the specific issue of percentage set-asides, the AFL-CIO representatives agreed that funds for postsecondary programs might very well be earmarked to prevent their being used for unintended purposes. They did state, however, that they had "serious doubts about any fixed allocation of postsecondary funds as between community colleges and four-year institutions." They argued that this kind of funding split might better be left to states for their determination in the light of their own patterns of institutional develop-

ment. The AFL-CIO representatives stated that they were opposed to vocational education program consolidation. They argued that the national government must provide aid to those programs that serve the national interest. "The need for these programs," they pointed out, "has been well identified, and the failure of the States to meet needs led to the enactment of the categorical programs in the first place. Frankly, we oppose consolidation because we view the record of the decentralized decision-making process as counterproductive to the realization of national needs."

OE administration of the vocational education programs was not directly addressed in the AFL-CIO testimony. However, they urged that the Congress make clear in its report on vocational education legislation that it expects the states to place greater emphasis on urban needs in vocational education. The AFL-CIO noted, as did the GAO, that state plans have often failed to concentrate vocational education funds in areas of highest need, particularly the urban inner-city areas, and that vocational education, which originated in a rural, agricultural setting, has since failed to keep pace with population shifts to urban centers.

The AFL-CIO directly addressed the question of the role of career education. In their view career education has consisted largely of conferences and very little money. They noted, "We are troubled by the serious possibility that career education will drain off funds intended for vocational education and we therefore suggest that career education be funded under a separate authorization."

The AFL-CIO position did not include specific recommendations in the areas of state boards for vocational education, authorization levels for the programs, or construction.

AASCU. In their testimony before the House, representatives of AASCU pointed out the large number of postsecondary vocational education

programs in operation on public four-year college and university campuses. They estimated that over 100 AASCU institutions would be offering approximately 1,500 postsecondary vocational programs, enrolling about 55,000 students in 1974. Therefore, they agreed with the AACJC proposal and others on the need for a postsecondary set-aside in federal vocational education funding. However, they strongly disagreed with the AACJC recommendation that 75 percent of these available postsecondary funds should be set aside for community colleges only.

They suggested a new idea that has not as yet been incorporated into any of the bills before the House or Senate committees. AASCU has proposed that postsecondary education funds within each state be allocated in the form of program support on a per-student basis. Their intention is that those institutions that actually offer the programs would receive the funds--whether they be community colleges or four-year schools. This AASCU proposal does suggest that an idea first included in the NASULGC bill be included in any legislation--that funds be set aside to increase access. The AASCU testimony included the recommendation that perhaps 20 percent of available funds might be set aside for the purpose of access as well as for the additional purposes of opportunity and choice. This AASCU proposal on postsecondary set-asides does include, as does the AACJC bill, the recommendation that a minimum of 40 percent be set aside for postsecondary vocational funding, that 40 percent also be set aside for the secondary level, and that the remaining 20 percent be allocated between the two levels at the discretion of a special state board convened for that purpose.

While the AASCU recommendations do not deal directly with the problem of program consolidation, they do show a special concern for the problem of duplication of vocational education programs. The

AASCU called to the attention of Congress a key section of the Vocational Education Act amendments of 1968 that has never been implemented. Section 104 (a)(5) of the law, relating to the National Advisory Council, mandates an annual review and report of the extent of duplication of vocational education programs at the postsecondary and adult levels in every state. This review and report is to be carried out by the National Advisory Council and is to be made annually to the secretary of HEW. The AASCU representatives said it was their understanding that in the years since the 1968 act, the National Advisory Council had ignored this section, except for one year in which a partial report was made. They suggest that this report be done in 1975 and in later years, pointing out that information called for in the report would be valuable to both the Congress and the federal government. The AASCU representatives did not deal with the issue of OE administration of the vocational education programs, nor did they discuss the role of career education or guidance and counseling. They did argue, however, that there should be separate state boards for postsecondary vocational education. They noted that the AACJC and other bills would encourage, but not mandate, separate state postsecondary boards. AASCU maintained that separate boards should be mandatory. They also suggested that technical amendments be adopted that would mandate participation of four-year colleges on the National Advisory Council and the state advisory councils as well.

The AASCU testimony did not include a discussion of either authorization levels of the vocational programs or construction.

ACE. The ACE put forth its views on vocational education legislation, particularly postsecondary vocational education, in a letter to Representative Perkins dated June 23, 1975. ACE requested that the statement be submitted for the hearing record.

ACE began by suggesting that further participation of postsecond-

ary institutions in occupational programs should be encouraged, arguing that the existing 15 percent set aside for postsecondary programs was obsolete and noting the growth of postsecondary vocational and adult programs throughout the country. ACE argued that it seems desirable to assure that a more realistic proportion of federal vocational funds be directed to the postsecondary sector. "At the same time, we would not wish to deprive secondary schools of needed funds they are now receiving." In its statement, therefore, ACE did not include a specific percentage set-aside for postsecondary vocational programs, stating its intention "to support increased authorizations and appropriations for vocational programs, so that higher funding levels for postsecondary programs would not be achieved at the expense of operating an effective program at the secondary level."

In this letter ACE did not deal with the issue of program consolidation nor with the problem of program administration, but suggested that planning of postsecondary occupational programs should be coordinated with other postsecondary programs. While the concept of a single state agency to administer vocational programs, as required by current legislation, may well be sound for purposes of administration and accountability of secondary vocational programs, the ACE stated its strong belief that planning for postsecondary occupational programs "should not be conducted separately or in isolation from planning for the entire range of postsecondary programs and institutions. Therefore, we suggest that the present requirement for a sole State administering agency be amended to require appropriate participation of the agencies having responsibility for postsecondary education in the planning and approval of postsecondary occupational programs."

In closing, ACE urged that further steps be taken to overcome sex bias in vocational education. ACE did not address the additional

vocational education issues of program administration, career education and guidance, or construction. It did recommend, however, that the broad purposes of Title X of the Higher Education Act (occupational education programs) be incorporated into the Vocational Education Act.

**Where do we go from here?**

Next steps

Upon completion of field hearings in early fall, Representative Perkins plans to move into legislative markup in the House. As noted earlier, the Perkins subcommittee will mark up only vocational education legislation since the subcommittee structure in the House separates consideration of vocational education legislation from that of higher education.

In the Senate the timing for possible vocational education legislation is similar. The Senate has completed its hearings on the subject of vocational education and currently plans to mark up vocational education legislation by late fall. The Senate, as mentioned previously, will put together an omnibus bill that includes higher education legislation as well as vocational education legislation at that time. It is quite possible, however, that the schedule in both the House and the Senate will slip, especially since the deadline for legislative action is mid-1976.

Content

It is too early to estimate what the content of vocational education legislation might turn out to be in the House and the Senate. It is not even clear which of the several vocational education bills will be used for markup. It may well be that currently authorized legislation will be used as a base for legislative markup.

Indications are that Representative Perkins tends to favor vocational programs as currently authorized. Thus it may be that only minor legislative changes will be made in the House. Representative Perkins has questioned witnesses who have advocated larger percentage set-asides in Part B funds for postsecondary occupational education. He has expressed concern that larger set-asides for postsecondary occupational education would take away funds for secondary vocational education.

In the Senate there appears to be a slightly more favorable attitude toward larger postsecondary occupational education set-asides. But even there it appears unlikely that major changes will be made in the Vocational Education Act as currently authorized. The next two months will probably indicate more clearly exactly what directions will be taken by the new vocational education legislation. The proposals and the options presented have been varied and extensive.

## Appendix A. Vocational Education Act as amended through 1974

Part A. General Provisions

The basic purpose of the Vocational Education Act is defined as being to provide grants to states to develop, maintain, extend, and improve new and existing programs of vocational education and to provide part-time employment for those students needing earnings to continue full-time vocational training. Students of all ages and abilities--in or out of high school or postsecondary institutions--who wish to learn new skills or upgrade current skills are to have access to "high quality," realistic training or retraining.

Part A specifically provides a program for students with special needs and allocates formula grants to states (no matching required). These grants are to be used for programs and services for students having academic, socioeconomic, or other social handicaps that prevent them from succeeding in regular vocational education programs. The program is not for those with physical or mental handicaps and is concentrated in communities where there is a high incidence of youth unemployment and high-school dropouts, in rural depressed areas, and in off-reservation Indian communities. Remedial and bilingual assistance is provided.

Part A, as well as other sections, authorizes appropriations for other parts of the act and creates both a National Advisory Council on Vocational Education and a series of state advisory councils. The National Council (21 members) must be broadly representative of employers, administrators of state and local vocational education programs, and postsecondary educators of handicapped, bilingual, or disadvantaged students, as well as parents and students. The duties of the National Council are to advise the OE commissioner about vocational education program operations, review and evaluate state

plans, and prepare an annual report to Congress and the President. State advisory councils must be established in every state receiving vocational education grants. Their membership requirements are similar to those of the National Advisory Council.

These state advisory councils must advise the state board on the development of the state vocational education plan, evaluate state vocational education programs, and prepare and submit to the commissioner of education an annual report describing the effectiveness of the programs in the state.

Part B. State Vocational Education Programs

Formula grants to states are provided to assist them in conducting vocational education programs. States are required to match every federal dollar with one dollar and must set aside 15 percent of these Part B funds for disadvantaged students, 15 percent for post-secondary education programs, and 10 percent for vocational education for the handicapped. Funds may be used for construction of area vocational education facilities. Comprehensive state plans must be developed in order to receive these funds.

Part C. Research and Training

Funds are authorized for research, for training programs for educators, for developmental programs to meet special vocational needs of disadvantaged youths, for demonstration and dissemination projects, and for establishing and operating state Research Coordinating Units that administer state vocational research programs and disseminate research findings. Fifty percent of the funds under Part C are allotted to states (with varying matching requirements), while the other 50 percent of the funds are reserved for the commissioner of

education and are used for project grants. From fiscal year 1972 through fiscal year 1974 these Office of Education-administered project grant funds were awarded to states on a population basis to establish a demonstration, testing, and development site for career education model programs.*

Part D. Exemplary Programs and Projects

Formula grants are awarded to states for the purpose of stimulating new ways to create bridges between school and employment. The commissioner reserves 50 percent of the available funds for discretionary grants or contracts that are distributed geographically as required by law, with at least one project in operation in each state. The remaining 50 percent of the funds is allocated to the state boards for vocational education for similar use. Up through fiscal year 1974 the commissioner has used the discretionary funds available to support career education projects. Projects are funded on a three-year basis.

Part E. Residential Vocational Education

The commissioner of education is authorized to make grants to state boards, colleges and universities, and others for demonstrating the feasibility of residential vocational education for students aged 15 to 21. Formula grants are also authorized for states to pay for the costs (90 percent of federal share) of planning, constructing, and operating residential vocational schools. Grants are to equal

*Since the passage of P.L. 93-380 in August 1974 separate career education funds have been made available, and it is expected that these Part C research funds will be used for general vocational education in the future.

the difference between actual annual interest rates paid on construction loans and 3 percent. No funds have been used for this part and the program has never been put into operation by the Office of Education.

Part F. Consumer and Homemaking Education

Formula grants are provided to assist states in conducting training programs in consumer and homemaking education. States must use at least one-third of the federal funds for programs in economically depressed areas or localities with high unemployment rates. Fifty percent state matching is required except where the funds are used in depressed or high unemployment areas. In those cases, only 10 percent state matching is necessary.

This program is distinguished from other parts of the law as it is not defined as vocational education for gainful employment. Occupational home economics programs are funded under Part B. However, programs under this section prepare students for the occupation of homemaking with emphasis on the dual role of homemaker and wage earner. Program funds are also used for ancillary services such as teacher training, curriculum development, research, and innovation in this field.

Part G. Cooperative Vocational Education

State formula grants for cooperative education programs are allocated. Arrangements are made between schools and employers, enabling students to receive vocational instruction in the school and related on-the-job training through part-time employment. Students must be at least 14 years of age and are paid the minimum wage or a student-learner rate established by the Department of Labor. Federal support

may cover program operations, added training costs to employers, payment for services or unusual costs to students while in training, and ancillary services. No state matching is required.

Part H. Work-Study Programs for Vocational Education Students

Funds are provided to states for work-study programs to be administered by local education agencies. These work-study programs are to assist economically disadvantaged full-time vocational educational students, ages 15-20, to remain in school by providing part-time employment with public employers. This is essentially an income-maintenance program for the economically deprived youth in school. About 2 percent of the funds are used for administration of the program. Priority is given to areas with high dropout rates and youth unemployment. Funding is 80 percent federal and 20 percent state and local.

Part I. Curriculum Development in Vocational and Technical Education

The commissioner of education is authorized to make grants or contracts with colleges, universities, state boards, and others to: (1) promote the development and dissemination of vocational educational curriculum material for new and changing occupational fields; (2) coordinate state efforts in the preparation of such material; (3) survey curriculum materials produced by other government agencies; and (4) train personnel in curriculum development. Most of these activities are carried out through individual projects. However, there are seven curriculum laboratories around the country that provide for national coordination. Five major categories--laboratories, dissemination, postsecondary, occupational cluster evaluation and testing, and career education--have been the focus of these curriculum development projects.

Part J. Bilingual Vocational Training

Funds are first authorized in fiscal year 1975. This program is directed at the critical problem of bilingual persons in obtaining vocational training and the shortage of instructors possessing job knowledge and skills as well as dual language capabilities.

This section authorizes grants or contracts with state or local education agencies, postsecondary institutions, and others to supply bilingual training in both established and new occupations for all those who desire and need such training.

## Appendix B. Vocational Education Act program statistics

Data for these tables were supplied by the Office of Education.

Table 1. Vocational education authorizations and appropriations for fiscal years 1972 to 1974

| Program | Authorization | | | Appropriation | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Fiscal year 1972 | Fiscal year 1973 | Fiscal year 1974 | Fiscal year 1972 | Fiscal year 1973 | Fiscal year 1974 |
| Part A, special needs | $ 60,000 | $ 60,000 | $ 60,000 | $ 20,000 | $ 20,000 | $ 20,000 |
| Part B, state programs | 607,500 | 508,500 | 508,500 | 376,682 | 376,682 | 405,347 |
| Part C, research | 67,500 | 56,500 | 56,500 | 18,000 | 18,000 | 18,000 |
| Part D, exemplary programs (state programs) | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 16,000 | 16,000 | 16,000 |
| Part F, consumer and homemaking education | 50,000 | 50,000 | 50,000 | 25,625 | 25,625 | 30,994 |
| Part G, cooperative education | 75,000 | 75,000 | 75,000 | 19,500 | 19,500 | 19,500 |
| Part H, work-study programs | 45,000 | 45,000 | 45,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | 7,849 |
| Part I, curriculum development | 10,000 | 10,000 | 10,000 | 3,981 | 4,000 | 4,000 |

NOTE: Figures are given in thousands of dollars.

Table 2. Vocational Education Act expenditures by source of funds for fiscal years 1972 and 1973*

| Program | Federal expenditures** | | State and local expenditures | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Fiscal year 1972 | Fiscal year 1973 | Fiscal year 1972 | Fiscal year 1973 | Fiscal year 1972 | Fiscal year 1973 |
| Grand total | $467 | $485 | $2,191 | $2,550 | $2,658 | $3,035 |
| Part A, special needs | 21 | 22 | 12 | 11 | 33 | 33 |
| Part B, state programs | 370 | 387 | 1,951 | 2,277 | 2,321 | 2,664 |
| Part C, research | 14 | 10 | 5 | 5 | 19 | 15 |
| Part D, exemplary programs (state programs only) | 8 | 9 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 13 |
| Part F, consumer and homemaking education | 26 | 26 | 201 | 222 | 227 | 248 |
| Part G, cooperative education | 20 | 22 | 13 | 27 | 33 | 49 |
| Part H, work-study programs | 6 | 6 | 5 | 4 | 11 | 10 |
| Part I, curriculum development | 2 | 3 | | | 2 | 3 |

NOTE: Figures are given in millions of dollars.

*The Office of Education reports that fiscal year 1974 expenditure figures are not yet available.
**Includes carryover funds.

Table 3. Vocational educational enrollment by program for fiscal years 1972 to 1974*

| Programs | Total | | | Secondary | | | Postsecondary | | | Adult | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 |
| Grand total (unduplicated)** | 11,602 | 12,072 | 13,556 | 7,232 | 7,354 | 8,433 | 1,304 | 1,350 | 1,573 | 3,066 | 3,369 | 3,549 |
| Part A, special needs | 191 | 146 | | 125 | 95 | | 37 | 17 | | 29 | 34 | |
| Part B, state programs | 8,326 | 8,732 | | 4,703 | 4,756 | | 1,226 | 1,302 | | 2,397 | 2,674 | |
| Part F, consumer and homemaking education | 3,166 | 3,193 | | 2,469 | 2,503 | | 31 | 30 | | 666 | 661 | |
| Part G, cooperative education | 119 | 168 | | 101 | 129 | | 18 | 40 | | 0 | 0 | |
| Part H, work-study programs | 31 | 34 | | 23 | 27 | | 8 | 7 | | 0 | 0 | |

NOTE: Figures are given in thousands.

*Fiscal year 1974 figures for enrollment by program are not yet available from the Office of Education.
**Individual figures do not add to grand total since the grand total represents an unduplicated count.

Table 4. Estimated vocational education enrollment by racial or ethnic group in fiscal year 1972*

| Education level | American Indian | Black | Oriental | Spanish-surnamed | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grand total | 83,074 | 1,660,585 | 98,962 | 735,516 | 8,471,332 | 11,049,469 |
| Secondary | 61,014 | 1,127,253 | 69,135 | 463,689 | 5,144,462 | 6,865,553 |
| Postsecondary | 8,694 | 139,149 | 14,216 | 95,238 | 1,008,808 | 1,266,105 |
| Adult | 13,366 | 394,183 | 15,611 | 176,589 | 2,318,062 | 2,917,811 |

*Six states and territories did not report. The Office of Education has not collected similar data from the states since fiscal year 1972.

Table 5. Current Vocational Education Act proposals classified by issue

| | Present law | AVA bill (H.R. 3037, S. 941) | AACJC bill (H.R. 3036, S. 939) | NASULGC bill (H.R. 4797, S. 942) | Administration's bill (H.R. 6251, S. 1863) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Percentage allotment (for Part B funds) | 15% disadvantaged, 15% postsecondary, 10% handicapped, 50-50 state matching requirement | 15% disadvantaged, 30% postsecondary and adult; 10% of money remaining after set-aside for the disadvantaged is for handicapped; no state matching requirement | 40% secondary, 40% postsecondary, and 20% for either; of 40% postsecondary money, 75% must go to junior colleges; 15% and 10% set-asides for the disadvantaged and handicapped are retained in both 40% portions | 40% secondary, 40% postsecondary, 20% for either; 15% and 10% for the disadvantaged and handicapped is retained for both 40% funds; funds must be used for the purpose of promoting access; 50-50 state matching requirement is retained | None; assurance that 25% of funds go to persons with special needs must be in state plan; 40-60 federal-state matching requirement |
| Program consolidation | None | Parts E, F, and G consolidated; Part A repealed; new part for teacher education, placement, and follow-up, and student work-study | Parts C, D, and I consolidated; Parts E, F, G, H, and J neither amended nor extended | None | All existing program categories consolidated into two broad titles, "Vocational Education Programs and Services" and "Grants for Research, Innovation or Demonstration" |

Table 5 (continued)

| | Present Law | AVA bill (H.R. 3037, S. 941) | AACJC bill (H.R. 3036, S. 939) | NASULGC bill (H.R. 4797, S. 942) | Administration's bill (H.R. 6251, S. 1863) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Program administration | State board has latitude, and OE does little monitoring; state plan due to OE annually | State plan due biennially; OE-BOAE beefed up; state accountability report due biennially; annual report due from states on receipt and distribution of federal dollars | State planning could be improved; state plan for postsecondary 40% funds must be prepared by state 1202 commissioner, not state vocational education board | State-level planning and evaluation requirements spelled out | OE to provide better data to states; state plans to be improved |
| Career education and guidance | Permitted but not emphasized (career education included in education amendments of 1974) | New section for grants to develop programs of career education personnel development, curriculum development, and career center services | Issue not addressed directly | Not included directly, but guidance personnel development mentioned as possible program | Not spelled out; guidance and counseling activities can be funded |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| State boards | One | One | One or two, depending on state; local coordinating committees authorized | May be one or two; state 1202 commission responsible for postsecondary planning | One |
| Authorization levels | $565 million for basic grants (fiscal year 1975) | $842 million for basic grants (fiscal year 1976); other authorization levels increased or maintained | Present levels extended | Not included | Lowered; $358.7 million basic grants plus other consolidated programs (fiscal year 1976) |
| Construction | Authorized | Authorized | Residential vocational education program dropped; leasing, renting, and remodeling permitted | Not mentioned | No new construction out of federal funds |